

P E A C E  
W I T H O U T  
U N I O N.

By way of Reply, to Sir H— M—s

PEACE at HOME.

*Enger*



*Hæc placuit semel hoc decies ~~repetito~~ repetita placebit*

L O N D O N,

Printed in the Year, MDCCIII.

E A C E

THE

ANNALS

OF THE

REIGN

OF

THE

# Peace without Union.

*By way of Reply, to Sir H---- M-----h's*

## PEACE at HOME.

I Cannot without some Astonishment observe, that a Gentleman of such Extraordinary Reading, master of so much more than Ordinary Knowledge, so much an Orator, and so much a Statesman, as this Author, should begin a Discourse of so much Consequence as this, with a Positive Assertion, for which there can be no manner of Foundation in History.

At least the general Practice of all Nations, both Antient and Modern, ever since there has been Diversity of Religions in the World, stand directly contrary to what this Gentleman has advanc'd; and I wish he had been pleas'd to quote those few Instances, which he can find in Story, to make out what he lays down.

*All wise Nations in the World, says this Gentleman, have been convinc'd by Reason and Experience, and do agree at this Day, and have for many Ages past, that there is an absolute Necessity of an Establish'd Religion, and a National Church.*

This may have some Truth in it, tho' not without just Exceptions, which I avoid; because, I would not Dispute with him for small Matters, but then he goes on.

*And that for the Peace and Welfare of every Government, it is also Necessary to preserve the Administration of publick Affairs in the Hands of Persons of One, and the same perswasion in Matters of Religion, that there may be Unity, and Uniformity in the Church and State.*

No Wonder, if from Premises so ill Grounded, wrong Conclusions are drawn. If all the Gentlemen in *England* believ'd this to be true, they had the greatest Reason in the World to Vote for a Bill, not only to prevent Occasional Conformity of the Dissenters, but absolutely to Fore-close from any share in the publick Administration, any one that had but the least Taint or Infection of Dissenting Principles, that are, or had been Dissenters, or were Favourers of them.

What could the Dissenters pretend to object against such Proceedings, if it were to be proved they were absolutely Necessary for the publick Peace, and for the general good of the Constitution; and that it was the Practice of all Nations in like Cases.

No True *English* Representative could satisfy themselves, or Answer it to their Country, not to secure them in such Cases. It would be unreasonable to Expect, that we should be made less Safe than other People, but if two Opinions in Matters of Religion be incompatible with the publick Administration; if 'tis Necessary that they, who have the same Interest in the State, and the same Zeal for the Service of their Prince, and the same Love to their Country,



must have the same Opinion in Points of Religion, or that the least Difference in Religious Matters, tho' in but indifferent Points of Ceremony and Discipline, should so Marr and Spoil all the other Beauties of their Conduct, that they should not be fit to be Trusted or Employed; if these Things are true, either from the Nature of the thing, or from the general Practice of all Ages; then a Bill of Exclusion of all Dissenters with all our Hearts.

But if upon Examination it shall appear, that this Maxim which stands as the Argument and Frontispiece of the whole Work, be ill Grounded.

If it shall appear that in several Nations, and those some of the wisest in the World, the Administration of their publick Affairs has been frequently committed to the general Care of all Sorts of the Subjects, and able Ministers of those Nations, have been Employ'd without respect to their Opinions in Religion, and that some Princes have equally Trusted and Employ'd People of differing Opinions in Religion, in the most Secret and Critical Parts of Government.

If these Things appear, the Foundation of this fine Spun Trick of State must fall to the Ground, and an Answer to this one Paragraph may very well pass for a full Reply to the Book, since if the Doctrine be overthrown, the Uses and Application fall of Course; as naturally as a House will follow, when the Foundation is undermin'd.

Let us look a little into History to find out the Truth of Fact, and tho' it would be too Remote to Examine the *Roman* Histories; yet 'tis not amiss to observe, that we find the Christians often times trusted in the Armies, and in the State, especially in the Interval of Persecution, and afterwards in the Western Empire; we find even *Julian*, the Apostate had several of his chief Captains in the Army that were Christians, and we find several Martyrs who were Officers of the State, and in the Army; we find a whole Legion of Christians trusted with the Arms of the Commonwealth, to whom they not only were Faithful and Valiant Soldiers, but to the Glory of the Christian Religion chose rather to Sacrifice their Lives for their Religion, than to defend themselves against the Government which Employ'd them: And as this Loyalty of principle has not a little been boasted of by the Advocate of a late abdicated Doctrine, call'd, tho' wrongfully, *Passive Obedience*, it seems strange to me it should so soon be forgotten.

But to go from these Ages of the World which afford so great a Variety of Example, that 'tis too much to Transcribe, and for which I refer to the Histories of those Days, which are very plain in the Case.

Let us come to Examine the more Modern Example of the Christian Princes and Nations, and as to their Wisdom, I'll leave that to the Censure of Sir H——— M———.

*Charles V.* Emperor of *Germany*, may be allow'd to be the first great Enemy of the Protestant Religion in *Europe*, he Persecuted the Dissenters in *Bohemia* and *Saxony* with the utmost Severity, and yet both in *Bohemia*, *Hungaria* and *Transylvania* at all times of Peace, the Protestants were admitted to an equal Share in the Administration of Civil Affairs to the Government of Cities, and Command of Armies.

And as in this short Tract, I cannot pretend to cite Persons and particulars, I choose to refer my Reader to the several Histories of the Peace, made between the said *Charles V.* and his Subjects of *Bohemia*, and between *Ferdinand* King of *Hungary*, and afterwards Emperor, his *Hungarian* Subjects in both which Capitulations he shall find; as I doubt not our learned Author well knows, that the Protestant Subjects of both those Kingdoms obtain'd as a reasonable Concession, the Governments of Provinces, their Places in the Councils of State, Assemblies of Burghers, and the like.



To come a little nearer home, the Treaty of *Westphalia* and *Munster*, which are the Settlements on which the whole Liberty of *Germany* depends, the Foundation of the Order and Oeconomy of the *Roman* Empire, and the Confirmation of the Golden Bull, by this Treaty, the Protestant Princes and States are not only restored to the Government of themselves, but to their due Interest in the Mutual Government of the general Body, they have their Seats and Suffrages in the Colleges of Princes, and in the College of Electors; neither Peace nor War can be made without them, they make up the Imperial Diet, join in Councils, and join their Forces. The Grand Councils of the Empire are full of Protestant Statesmen, and all the Imperial Armies full of Protestant Officers; nay, sometimes wholly Commanded by Protestant Generals. For I think 'tis generally observ'd in those Days, as well as now, that they were always willing we should fight for them, but not willing we should get by them.

In several of the petty Governments and Principalities, where their Governments are Elective, the Constitution is so careful to preserve this Union of Parties, that the Government is alternate, one Prince must be a *Roman* Catholic, and the other a Protestant, as in the Bishopricks of *Hildesheim*, *Osnabruck*, and others; and if the Government it self is so, I believe I need not search the History of those places, to Examine whether their Ministers, Counselors and Statesmen are promiscuous or alternate, as the Government.

The late Duke of *Neubourg*, being a *Roman* Catholic, came by Inheritance to the Government of the *Palatinate*, a Country wholly Protestant; the old Prince being a Man of Temper and Policy, in his Speech to his Council, declar'd himself to this purpose, That he would make no Innovation in the Religion of the Country, nor make any Difference or Distinction of any of his Subjects upon the account of their Religion; whoever were Faithful and Loyal to his Government, should be equally Entitled to his Services and Favour, and this promise he punctually observ'd, to the satisfaction of all his Subjects, and the happiness of his whole Country, and had his Son, the present Elector *Palatine*, thought fit to have maintain'd the same Ballance and Equality among his Subjects, the Protestant Princes had not made such loud complaints of the Infractions of the Treaty of *Munster* and *Ryswick*, nor have been backward in the present Affairs of the Empire, for want of due satisfaction on those Heads.

In *France* we find *Charles IX.* employing promiscuously the *Hugonot* Princes of the House of *Bourbonne*, the King of *Navarr*, the Prince of *Conde*, *Jasper Coligni* made High Admiral, the Prince of *Conti* Governor of *Champaign*, *Mr. Le Desguieres* Governor of *Dauphine*, and abundance of *Hugonots* admitted into Places in the Court, in the Parliament, and in the Finances.

*Henry III.* committed himself to the Protection of the King of *Navarr* and the *Hugonots*, from the fatal Conspiracies of the Catholic League, join'd the *Roman* Catholic Army to the Protestant, and as he found them both Zealous and Faithful to him, admitted them to all his Councils.

And when afterward that Prince was barbarously Assassinated by a *Jacobine* Fryer, the *Roman* Catholic Princes and Army join'd sincerely with the Protestant, and serv'd the Great *Henry IV.* tho' a Protestant against the Army of the League, tho' of their own Religion.

Afterwards when *Henry IV.* turn'd *Roman* Catholic he maintain'd the same Communication of Favours to all Parties, and from the Peace at *Vervins*, which put a final end to that War, and finish'd the Catholic League, to the Year 1682, When the present *French* King abolish'd the Edict of *Nants*, the Protestants were universally admitted into Governments, Places, Preferments and Employments, even from the Presence and Bed-Chambers of the Prince, thro' all the  
nicest



nicest and most dangerous parts of the State, as the Parliament, Finances, Court, Armies and Fleets. Among these Men we find the Marshal *De Biron*, the Duke of *Saxe Weymar*, Monsieur *Di Guebriant*, Le Marechal de *Marrillac*, Monsieur *Fouquett*, the great *Turenne*, Monsieur *du Quesne*, and Count *de Schomberg* with innumerable others, who were not only Employ'd, but were really the Pillars of the House of *Bourbonne*, and the Raisers of the *French Power*, to a great part of its present Greatness. Nor indeed can I suffer this part of the Matter without a Remark, that this seems to be the only Instance of a Nation that has suppress'd one Party, for Establishing another, on the bare Pretences of Religion.

During all the time these Protestant Princes and Gentlemen were in Employment under the Kings of *France*, the *Romish* Religion was the Establish'd Church, and the Government was all in their Hands; neither were the *Hugonots* under any legal Establishment other than the Edict of *Nants*, all their Power was broke at the Siege and taking of *Rochebelle*, and they were wholly in the Hands of their Enemies, and yet the King of *France* all along thought fit to employ them both in the Civil and Military Matters, till the the present King of *France* began to turn them out of all Publick Employments, in order to extirpate them wholly from the Nation, as he has now effectually brought to pass.

If a like Extirpation of the Dissenters in *England* is the real design, the removing them from all the Privileges and Advantages of their Native Country is the very best step they can take to it: Nor is this the least reason to make us believe that is in the Design, for to what purpose else should this Gentleman bring so scandalous an Example on the Stage, I can find but one of these two Reasons possible to be given for it. 1. Either that as the *French King* began the Extirpating of the Protestants by first dismissing them of all publick Employments, so he would have it to be here. Or, 2. that in all his Reading he could not find one Example in History that would suit the present Case, and I think I may fairly challenge him to shew me any Nation in the World, that ever so far suppress'd a part of their own Subjects as to deprive them of the Favour of their Prince and the Trust of Government, but with a design of either to persecute or totally expel them.

If this Learned Gentleman can think to convince us that thus to humble the Dissenters by a Law, and to offer them the restraint he proposes is the way to Peace at Home, he cannot at the same time but suppose that the Dissenters are very blind Ignorant People.

Nor can he suppose that this will tend to the Peace which Her Majesty has proposed to us, *Peace join'd with Union*, the *French King* has brought about the Destruction of the Protestants in *France* with a full Peace, but not with Union. 'Tis *Union* is the matter which as it is the Essence of Peace, so 'tis the only thing can make this Nation happy, and I would be glad to see how the least Prospect of an Union of Parties can be seen in the Scheme he hath drawn.

Let us next examine the Government of Our Neighbours the *Dutch*, where, if I mistake not, the *Calvinists* are the Establish'd Church, yet have they no Test or Disabling Laws; but as the Government, is Protestant the Roman Catholicks have their freedom; not by a limited; restrain'd, precarious Tolleration, but by Native Light, and a Claim of Title, the States approve, and Confirm the Provincial and the Missions of the Pope, and the Roman Catholicks, enjoy the Liberties and Privileges of other Subjects, and serve in their Armies and Fleets with promiscuous and unexceptioned Liberty.



I know no other Nation where the Roman Catholicks are Masters, and that ever had any other Religion among them, but what still accepts the Services of their Subjects of whatsoever Religions. In *Spain, Italy, and Portugal*, the Inquisition has effectually Dam'd all Religions but their Own, and in this Case they are still but Examples of what some People are willing should come to pass here. But if we go back, even among the *Spaniards* themselves, in the Days of *Philip the Second of Spain*, the Nobility and Gentry of the 17 Provinces, had many of them Embrac'd the Protestant Religion, and yet were continued in great Employments in the State, as the Prince of *Orange*, Count *Horn*, Count *Egmont*, and Multitudes of others: And 'tis Observable, that the Breach afterwards did not begin upon account of Dismissing them their Employments, but upon a Design of rooting out the very Name of a Protestant from the Country, by bringing in the Inquisition upon those Provinces, which together with the Tyranny of the Duke *D'Alva*, was the Occasion of the final Defection of the Provinces, and the Erecting the present Powerful State of the United Provinces.

These are the blessed Examples of latter Ages, when People have been Depriv'd of the Birth-right and Priviledges of Subjects, on meer Account of Opinions in Religion. One was a step to the utter Extirpation of the Party so depriv'd, and the other drove them to all Extremities, and being joyn'd to other Intolerable Oppressions, caus'd a General Disorder, made a vast Chasm in the Government, and made a Civil War of 42 years, which ended in the Universal Revolt and alienation of the Seven Provinces.

Let us now look back a little to our own Country, and desire our Brethren of the Church of *England* to remember the Time when they were Dissenters themselves, when they were obnoxious to, and separated from the Establish'd Church, they were not treated in this manner, no not by the Papists themselves; in the days of King *Henry the 8th.* the Lord *Cromwel*, Queen *Ann*, and abundance of the Nobility and Gentry were Protestants and *Lollards*, and yet continued in publick Trust, and in the Services of their King and Country.

And had not in Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, the many restless Designs of *Spain* appear'd so busie, and the *English* Catholicks been so weak to Embroil themselves with the State, and against her Person, they had continued in Employments and Places to the last; and 'twas Reason of State, and not of Religion, which oblig'd her to treat them so roughly.

Thus I think I have taken a short view of History, with Relation to this Gentleman's advanc'd Maxim, That all wise Nations have thought it necessary, to preserve the Administration of Publick Affairs in the hands of Persons of one and the same Perswasion in matters of Religion: which I think is fairly Confuted; if he thinks not, on a more narrow search, I shall be content to give him many more particulars of these things, the Places where, Time when done, and the Authors where the Accounts are to be found.

*Strada*, complaining of the Unreasonableness of the Discontents of the *Netherlanders*, tells us, they had nothing to Complain of, for that tho' they were Hereticks, they were admitted to the Favour of their Sovereign, equally with the Catholicks, and were Employ'd by him in the greatest Posts of Trust and Honour.

From what part of the World now will this Learned Author pick out his Wise Nations, who thought it necessary to preserve the Administration of Publick Affairs, in the Hands of Persons of One and the same Perswasion in matters of Religion? I should think the World had been much more Oblig'd to him, if in this Case he had been pleas'd to tell us who these wise Nations are, and I am perswaded 'twill appear when they are found they were



not the wiser for doing so, and that it never appear'd to be their Interest to attempt it.

I am led now to his Second Assertion, viz. *Where-ever a National Church hath been Establish'd by Acts of Uniformity, as in this Kingdom, the wise Legislators have generally Establish'd some Test, &c.*

It is very hard a Gentleman of this Author's Quality and Learning should have the Misfortune to lay down but two Fundamentals as the Plat-form of his whole Discourse, and at the same time Dedicate them to his Sovereign, and be mistaken in both.

Sure this Gentleman could not Imagine that things so remote from the knowledge of any Historian, could do any thing else than cause them that had read Books to look back into History, to find the time when these Tests and other Securities were Establish'd.

If 'twas Expected that these things should be taken upon Trust, as Merchants pay Bills for the Honour of the Drawer, I am sorry that Gentleman could forget that these Ages of Faith are at an End, and People are not so willing to believe one another as they used to be; and since there are so many among us, who are willing to Impose upon the Credulity of others, People are grown more Incredulous, and no Man of Honesty now thinks it below him to lay down Proofs of what he says, nor takes it Unkindly that he is not believ'd upon his parole, since where Demonstrations are to be had, 'tis as easy to give them as to let them alone; and where they are not, no Wise Man will be positive.

Indeed there is One way for this Gentleman to bring himself off in this Case, and that is finely couch'd in the manner of his wording the Second General Head of this Argument; whether 'tis Contriv'd on purpose or no, I will not pretend to Determine: *Where-ever a National Church, says he, hath been Establish'd by Acts of Uniformity, as in this Kingdom, the wise Legislators have generally Establish'd some Test, &c.* This may be true, and yet no Test but ours be Establish'd in the World, because no National Church in the World hath been Establish'd by Acts of Uniformity, as in this Kingdom. If this be the meaning of our Author, he has room to come off indeed, and I am very willing he should come off thus, for I am fully perswaded he can shew us no National Church in the World Establish'd by Acts of Uniformity, as in England, nor no Test or exclusive Conditions, where a Religion is Tollerated in a Nation, but the Professors of it Excluded from all Trust or Employment in the Country.

In Spain and Italy, there is an Establish'd Uniform Church, but there is no Test of admission; a Man not only must be a Papist, but exactly, nicely, and constantly adhere to every tittle, as the Priests direct; the whole Religion of the Country is the Test, and then 'tis not a Test of qualification, but of Life, Estate, and abiding in the Place: Witness the carrying the Count D'Contarini and his Lady, and several of his Domesticks, lately to the Prison of the Inquisition in Rome, for only favouring some Opinions which the Priests did not think Catholick.

In France, total Conformity to the National Establish'd Church is absolutely Requir'd, on pain of Banishment, Confiscation, and Death. If this be Vouch'd as a proper Test, I commend the Practice to our Author from the Goodness of the Example; and 'tis my Opinion he may with as much ease defend the sending all the Dissenters out of the Nation, and Condemn their Ministers to the Gallows and Gallies, that is to go to work with them the shortest way, as he may Defend the Case he has undertaken, at least I am satisfied he may find more Precedents in History among the Wise Nations he speaks of.

After this unhappy Ground Plot laid, what wretched Fabrick are we to



to Expect! Consequences are always just to their Causes, wrong Conclusions must follow where wrong Premises are laid down.

From having first Deriv'd the Cause of this Bill, from the practice of some wise *Nations in Nubibus*, not pleasing to tell us who they are, this Gentleman descends to Defend the Letter of the late Law, and advances to the World that it is no breach of the Toleration Act.

Instead of a Reply, I shall here take the freedom to tell him a short story: "Two Gentlemen of Quality in the French Court, falling out, prepar'd to Decide their Controversy by the Sword. But Notice having been given of their Intentions, the King of *France*, who has been particularly severe upon his Subjects upon the Point of Duelling, sends to one of these Gentlemen his repeated Prohibition to fight, assuring him that if he Dar'd to Transgress his Command, he would shew him no Mercy; but being again Inform'd, that, on some fresh Insults from his Adversary, he had resolv'd to meet him; the King Ordered this Gentleman to be taken up, and to give Security that he would not Engage.

"The other Gentleman had so little Government of himself, as still to Insult him, upon which he gave him this Answer, Sir, If you please to obtain a Licence for me to Dispose of my Estate to my Family, I'll fight you, tho' I am sure to be hang'd.

The Application of the story in short, is thus, 'tis Easy to advance an Argument under the favour of Power, which he that answers must do it at the hazard of the too Mighty Displeasure of the State: but I'll make my Author this fair offer.

As to what is doing in the House, I neither know, nor meddle; but if he will please to Obtain for me by Authority the Liberty of Speech, in this Particular, I am Content to accept it, upon this Condition, That if I do not prove the Late Bill to be directly contrary both to the Act of Toleration, and of it self Destructive of Liberty of Conscience, and opposite to the Express words of the Preamble, which says, that Persecution for Conscience is Contrary to the profession of the Christian Religion, and the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, That then I may be stigmatiz'd for a Coxcomb, and banish'd the World as an Incendiary and Common Disturber.

Can any Man pretend to say, that the Dissenters may Enjoy their Liberty of Conscience, if they will be Contented with it? I humbly presume to affirm, there is not one Dissenter who is not Contented with liberty of Conscience, if there be, the whole Body of Dissenters will readily Disown him. And if the Government would put the Dissenters to the Tryal any way, but what may infringe their Liberties as *English* men, and their Consciences as Christians, I doubt not but they would presently Determine it to the Satisfaction of the World and their Own just Vindication.

I am sorry to be restrained here from the just recriminations which this Usage of the Dissenters puts into my Mouth, by which I believe I could easily lay Open the Secret Drift and Design of some Gentlemen in pleading for such a Bill — But I cannot refrain making some Observations of the Manner of their Management.

And to begin with the Gentleman before me, who has put forth all his Power of Eloquence, in which he is known to abound, to gild over the Poyson of his Principle with the shining Article of Peace.

So, Sir, the *French* King enjoys Peace, all his *Hugonot* Subjects being banished or oppress'd, their Ministers working at the Oar, under the Roman Guardians, spurr'd on by the Zealots of the Church.

Is it Peace that you seek, Sir, by Depriving your Brethren of their Birth-right?



right? And that not because they cannot Conform to you, but because they can. It may be Peace, Sir, *French Peace*, but *where's the Union?* where's the Conjunction of hearts and hands that are so requisite, and which her Majesty presses so Earnestly in a time of the Nation's Difficulty; and the terrible Successes of a growing Enemy? Can you suppose the Dissenters to be men of so much self-Denial, that they can first be thus us'd, and then Unite with you heart and hand in the Great Work of the publick Defence? If you can, you must allow them to be better Christians, than you seem to believe of them, and will find it very difficult to make out another Position of yours, *that the Government cannot be safe while they are concern'd in it.*

And why not safe? Dare you bring your Loyalty to the Test with theirs? Have they rebell'd against Governments, or ruin'd their Governours, any oftner than the Men of the Church? you have been fairly Challeng'd to the Enquiry, and to come to a Ballance about Loyalty, and your own knowledge tells you, that the Loyalty of both Church-men and Dissenters stands upon an Equal foot.

You have as often been told, that the mis managements of the Late Reign, of which such loud Complaints are made, and about which such pains have been taken, let it lye where it will, cannot lye at the Door of the Dissenters; you can name but two known Dissenters that were in any Considerable post of Trust in all that Government, and after all the retrospect of Mismanagement, and all the Care which has been taken to Cast the Reproaches of ill Conduct and Unfaithfulness upon them, they both dyed in the Service of their Country, and left behind them a spotless Character, an unblemish'd Honesty, and even their Enemies will allow that two better Officers in their stations the Government never had; and I am far from being asham'd of their Names, match them if you can, They were *Thomas Papilion*, and *Mordecai Abbot*, one in the Victualling Office, the other in the Exchequer.

I do not find among all the black Roll of the Nation's Thieves, One Dissenting Thief, I make no question but if they were to be found out we should long since have heard of them.

We have lent Our Money to the Government, lost Our Money by the Government, but we have got nothing from the Government, but in Common with the rest.

Not, Gentlemen, but that we may have Knaves among us as well as you; but I believe we may make the Church of *England* this fair offer, that if they please to make good Our Losses by their Church Knaves, we are very free to come to an Account, and refund all that can be Charg'd upon Our Dissenting Knaves. But till they accept this, let me say the Frauds and Mismanagement of Affairs lyes among ye, Gentlemen, we have had but a very small share in them.

In short, no Betrayers of the Nation's Secrets, no Corresponders with the Nation's Enemies, no False Endorsers of Exchequer Bills, no Counterfeitters of the Royal ——— No Commissioners without Accounts, No pay-Masters without Vouchers, or Treasurers without Cash, are to be found among us: what then have we done, that you Sir should Misrepresent us to the Nation as Enemies to the publick Safety, and urge the Necessity of this Bill for the publick preservation?

If this is to be brought upon us as a punishment, where is Our Crime? if Our Crime is as you alledge, we Claim to be heard.

What the House of Commons please to do I have nothing to say to, and am not now Treating with you as a Member of that House. But since you have rank'd your self with the Authors, and come among those who appeal



peal to the People, it is, Sir, in your Scribling Capacity that I am Concern'd with you and no other.

I wonder that a Man of your Judgment should put a Title of *Peace at home* upon a Book so contrary to the Title it bears.

You tell us the Dissenters, are struggling for Dominion and Power. I tell you no, Sir, They are struggling against Dominion and Power. As to their Desiring a Power to Destroy the Establish'd Church, I think 'tis ungratefully offered, since they so lately gave a Demonstration to all the World, that they chose the hazard of being Destroy'd with the Establish'd Church, rather than to let the Establish'd Church be Destroy'd, tho' it might have been done without their having any hand in it.

And if you are Ignorant of the Time, I may put you in mind that in K. James's Reign, when Our Liberty was given us *Gratis*, and offer'd to be Continued upon Extraordinary Terms too, nay and 'tis Easy to prove it was the Interest of the Court at that time to continue it. These scandalous fellows, Sir, that are not now fit to be trusted with setting a Drunkard in the Stocks, were solicited on all hands to Joyn with you in bringing to pass the Revolution, what fine things, what Union, what Temper was then promis'd us? And what more might we have obtain'd, if we had Capitulated for it? but we took you at your words, Condition'd for nothing but a Toleration, chose to live and dye with you, join'd heart and hand to re-establish this Church of yours which was then at the brink of Destruction — and yet we are the Men who wou'd Destroy this Establish'd Church.

What innumerable Reproaches have we daily from a Party of Men, who if we had said the word, had been no Party. But from a man of your Judgment, Sir, of your Learning and your wonderful Piety, this is a most strange thing, and I exceedingly admire how you came to forget your self.

But, Sir, since you are pleas'd to Embark your Pen in this Cause, and Undertake to prove the Dissenters a people who ought to be restrained, of whom it would be absolutely necessary to make Laws to keep them out of the Government, and all branches of the Administration. I think you so far Oblig'd in honour to accept a fair Invitation, in which you shall not want some more able head than mine, either by Pen and Ink, or by Conference, to make out these few heads.

1. That a Bill against Occasional Conformity is not a Repeal in Part of the Act of Toleration.
2. That there is a Necessity of such a Bill for the safety and preservation of the Church.
3. That the Church is in any Danger of being Destroy'd by the Dissenters.
4. That any thing like this has been the practice of Nations abroad, Except where the Design has been the Extirpation of the Party.
5. How this can be a Means to that Union which her Majesty Invites the Nation to.
6. Who are the Queen's best Subjects, and who most pursue her real Interest, they who push these Extremities at so Unseasonable a time as this; Or they who labour for Peace and Union, in Obedience to the Command of their Sovereign.

I Come now to the Questions he asks upon the whole Matter, after having been pleas'd to Satyrize upon the Mistakes, as he pleases to call them, which those persons fell into, who Argued against the Bill, which I suppose I may say without Injury to him is, to be understood of the Lords appointed to Mannage the Conference on this head, where 'twas alledg'd that

*the Dissenters were not Schismatics, that Occasional Conformity was not a New, but an Old Invention, that a Difference Ought to be put between Going to a Popish and a Protestant Meeting, and the Greatness of the Penalty exceeding the price of going to Mass, and the like. These are not the Questions, says this Gentleman; but this is the proper Question before us, in short, Whether it be Consistent with the Safety of the Establish'd Government either in Church or State, with the Wisdom of the English Nation, with the Practice of any wise Government in the World, or with the sure Intent and Meaning of the Test Act, to admit into publick Offices and Employments any persons who are not sincere Members of the National Church.*

These Questions are as fit as they are easy to Answer, and therefore I shall Contract my Reply, always promising this Gentleman a fuller Explicatory, if not Satisfactory Solution of these Difficulties on Demand.

I must give a General Answer to the first Head of Questions in the affirmative: I do think it Consistent with all these Points, that the Employments and Publick Offices of the Government may be Committed to Men of Honesty, Integrity and Capacity, whatsoever their Opinions concerning matters of Religion may be.

Truly, Gentlemen, if these Publick Employments were to be in the Hands of none but Men of Principles, Men of Conscience and Religion, I should be in great Pain for some *Gentlemen in Office*, who are meer Occasional Conformists: Indeed, who never took a Sacrament any where till it became Necessary as a Qualification, and who have so much Honesty as to own they know little of the Matter, and don't trouble their Heads about it, who are of any Church; and as for Religion in general, have no manner of Occasion for it.

These Gentlemen are safe, no Clause in the Bill can touch them; Atheism was never charg'd as an Enemy to the Church and State, 'tis not the Men of no Religion, but the Men of too much Religion we are afraid of.

But to the Question, It may be safe to Commit the Trust of Publick Employments to Men of Different Opinions in Religion.

1. Because Men of Differing Opinions may be Honest, and it cannot be unsafe to Trust an Honest Man, whatever his Opinions be in Matters of Religion; now if this Gentleman will tell us, that a Dissenter cannot be an Honest Man, then let us tell Noses, and see who have the most Knaves the Church or the Dissenters.

2. Because it has been done without Danger, both here and abroad; and is done to this day among all the wise Nations he speaks of. Except as before Excepted.

But I own here does lye One Negative against me, and that is, about its being Inconsistent with the Design of the Test and Corporation Acts; and there I acknowledge him to be in the right: but then I must add, that those Acts themselves lye Crowded with such just Objections of Parties, private Interests, and Principles destructive to the true Interest of the Protestant Religion, and the Nation in General, as I am perswaded this Gentleman with all his skill is not able to Defend.

If this Bill does more fully Answer the End of the Test, and Corporation Bill, if any thing in those Acts are to be prov'd Unchristian and Unreasonable, 'tis but little for the Reputation of this Cause, that it tends to fulfil those Designs for which they were Design'd, but fell short.

To justify the Reasonableness of this Bill, 'tis alledg'd, That the Church cannot be safe without it. I would be glad to joyn issue with this Gentleman upon that Head. As to his canvassing the Reasons given by the Lords

last



last Session, I do not meddle with it, as a thing too long for this Tract; at the same time assuring him, it is not but that those Reasons are easily to be Defended.

But the proper Work before me, is to bring it to this short Head, the Pains are Extraordinary which are taken to possess People's Minds, that the Church is in danger from the Dissenters, and cannot be secur'd but by this Bill. And why in such danger from the Dissenters? Our Author owns they are surrounded with Deists, Papists, Socinians, and Occasional Conformists, and I could add with Atheists too, and yet all these, the Papist excepted, are Occasional Conformists also, but no Law is requir'd against them. By his Rule Men of no Religion may be admitted to Conform for a Place, and then Relapse to *Atheists, Socinians, Arians, Deists, and Hereticks*, with which the Church of *England* now abounds; all these, tho' Enemies to the very Being of Religion, may come to the Communion for a place, Occasionally Conform, and return to their ridiculing all Religion, bantering the Trinity, and blaspheming our Saviour's Divinity, and still by his Rule the Church is in no danger, but these may be trusted in highest Places of the Government with safety. But a Man that in his Opinion dissents in some Points of Religion, but can conform in part, tho' he be Conscientious, tho' he be never so Religious, this is a Dangerous Man, and it cannot be safe for the Church to have such a Man employ'd.

To what a strange pass will this Gentleman bring the Church of *England*, and what a Scandal will he bring upon the Foundation she stands upon, that she *may be serv'd by Knaves*, but dare not trust *Honest Men*, that Men of no Religion are fit enough for her Employments, but Men of Charity and Conscience are not.

If any Man ask me now, whether I am pleading for Occasional Conformity, *I freely Answer no*, nor do I approve of it in it self, but when made use of for a mere Qualification, I abhor both the Practices and the Persons.

But this Law is not at all the more to be justified from the Unjustifiableness of that practice, because this deprives those Men of a just Liberty, whose Consciences by the Toleration Act have that very thing allow'd them, which now will be restrain'd, and in that matter if in no other is an Infraction of that Act.

The Toleration Bill says, that the Penalties of certain Laws are taken off from the Dissenters, on Accounts of their not Conforming; here are new Penalties putting on, upon some that can Conform in part, because they cannot conform wholly.

But says this Gentleman, they may then quit the Offices, and then there is no Persecution. To which I Answer, to be forc'd to do it, is punishment, and punishment is Persecution.

'Tis not the Question whether a Dissenter can justify his Occasional Conformity to his own Conscience, but whether he can justify it to the Law; if he can do the last, then is the case no Crime; and to have a Law made against that which is no Crime, is what this Gentleman has not yet undertaken to meddle with.

The whole strain of this Argument, and which this Gentleman lays a very great stress on, is, That the Dissenters are Enemies to the Establish'd Church, and therefore 'tis not safe any part of the Administration of Publick affairs should be in their Hands.

That this is the specious Pretence, is very plain; but as I have already noted, this is a Foundation wrong laid, and can never be prov'd, nor made Out; and if these Gentlemen would come to a fair Examination of Circumstances, they could not prove that they have any just Grounds for it.

As to principles of Rebellion, and Enmity to Monarchies, and to the *Jus Divinum* of the Crown, how often have the Church been challeng'd to come to a Ballance of Loyalty with the Dissenters, nay tho' we were to thro' in all they can say of the Days of 41 into the Scale.

Even this Gentleman Owns, Fol. 9. what I affirm, they are his own words and deserve remark. *The Best of the Dissenters desire not Power and Dominion, but Liberty of Conscience and Exemption from penal Laws.* Say you so, Sir, then what Occasion of the Law, if your next words which are these are true? *The True Members of the Church, Desire no more than to see the Administration of publick Affairs in the hands of such as are well affected to the Establish'd Government.*

Now to bring these two together, those Dissenters who Desire not Power and Dominion, cannot be Unsafe in the Establish'd Government; why then shou'd the Church be so eager to shut them out of the Administration? This Argument lyes Directly against him.

As to the Test Act, I wish this Gentleman, who so often brings it in as a thing so Sacred, so Essential to the Churches safety, and so needful to be enforc'd, wou'd have been pleas'd to have Undertaken the Defence of the Morality of that Act in its own Nature, and a little Examin'd the Method of procuring it, and the Design of the Reigning Parties of those days; let him tell us whether that Act was made meerly to secure the Church, or whether those people who honestly meant the security of the Church, were not acted by another secret Party, who only design'd to uphold the Division between the Church and the Dissenters, in order at last to Destroy both. Let him tell us if he can *from what principle*, or in what Nation but ours, Divine and sacred Ordinances are Expos'd as the Test or Qualification for Secular Interest, and be made the Hand-maid of Parties, the Badge of a States-Man, and a Mark of Distinction.

Let him tell us what Unaccountable Prophanation of those sacred Institutions of *Christ Jesus* have been Occasion'd by Compelling and Obliging such to receive the Sacrament, who had no more Religion than a horse, and who made a jest of the Matter, whose practice amounts only to that of *Ratclifts Souldier*.

To be Godly a while, and then *as ye were*.

Let him defend the Policy of that Act too if he can. Let him tell me, if Mens honesty rather than their Opinions of Indifferent things in Religion, is not the more needful point to be examin'd as to Employments in the State, for here a Knave shall be employ'd if he will take the Test, and the more Knave he is, the less he will Scruple it. But the honest man shall be shut out, because his conscience permits him not to comply.

If the Nature, the Morality, or the Policy of that Act cannot be defended, then all the Arguments drawn from that Act fall to the Ground, and then I think his three great Foundations answer'd and overthrown.

1. I believe to have prov'd, That wise Nations in all Ages have thought fit to entrust the Administration of publick Affairs in the hands of persons of different Perswasions in Matters of Religion.

2. That useful and Honest Men may safely be employ'd, of whatsoever Perswasion or Opinion as to Religion, and Knaves are Unsafe of any Opinion.

3. That no National Church in the World excludes out of the Administration of publick Affairs any persons of such Opinions as by Law at the same time are Tolerated in the Nation.

To Tolerate a Religion or Opinion, and yet Count the Professors of it  
Intole-



Intolerable in the State, seems to have such an Incongruity of Circumstances as no Nation in the World can Parallel. In *Holland* the National Church are *Calvinists*, yet the Remonstrants and the *Roman Catholicks* are Tollerated. But let this Gentleman tell us how many more *Calvinists* than *Remonstrants* are among the Burghers of *Amsterdam*? If I am rightly inform'd, the Council of the Town are above two thirds of the Dissenting Remonstrants, and in their Armies and Fleets the *Roman Catholicks* are equally Advanc'd, are equally capable of Serving, and have Commissions granted them without any Test, Qualification, or other Obligation, than an Oath of Fidelity to the State, which in all Countries is esteem'd a sufficient Tye to an honest Man.

In *Scotland*, where so much out-cry of Persecution is made, tho' with so little reason, the National Church is *Presbyterian*, yet almost all the Offices and Administration is in the Hands of the *Episcopal* Dissenters, without any Test or other Qualification, than their Oaths of Allegiance to the Queen, and Recognition the Government.

Upon the whole 'tis plain the Design at least of this Author seems to be not to keep Men out of the Government for being Knaves, but for being Dissenters; for by this Law he that will take the Sacrament, and go to a Meeting, shall not be fit for a Place of Trust; but he that will go from the Sacrament to a Bawdy-House, remains as well Qualified as before.

A Dissenter tho' of never so much Honesty and Principles shall be made incapable of the Service of his Country, and rendred suspected to the Government, while a Man of no Principles at all, that will take a Sacrament in the Morning, be Drunk and Swear at the Priest that gave it him in the Afternoon, that will Blaspheme God, Banter Religion, Buffoon the Face of the Government, be as Leud and Irreligious as the Father of Mischief can make him, is suffer'd to enjoy all the Advantages of Office, Government and Administration, and with-held from nothing that's Wicked, the Scandalous Crime of a Meeting-House only excepted.

There is really something Mysterious in this, something odd and unaccountable, and unless the Gentlemen who are for this Bill can give some better Reasons for it than Sir *Humphery* has thought fit to make Publick, I see nothing yet advanc'd but what is so easy to be Answer'd, that I wonder to see him offer things so Absurd.

His being sensible of this I am perswaded was the Birth of his Post-script, in which he tells us, That he does not from thence conclude, that so Wise and so Great an Assembly are not able to Amend their own Bill, and to order it so as the passing such a Bill may neither be a Snare to the Church-man, nor a Prejudice to the Dissenters, such a Bill as will not Destroy but Preserve our Religion, Laws and Liberties, and evermore Establish Peace and Unity amongst us, and settle our Constitution upon a sure and lasting Foundation.

This is fine Language, and like Sir *Humphery*, who all Men know is Master of good Words, Sounds well in the Mouth. But let us examine a little the Signification of this, and certainly never were so many Words put together to less purpose as to the Argument in Hand; Nay, so unhappily is this Post-script brought in at the Close, that 'tis as it were a saying the whole Book backward like a Witches Prayers, 'tis unravelling all the Thread of the former Discourse.

If the Parliament can make such Amendments to their Bill as shall make it no Snare to the Church-man, nor Prejudice to the Dissenter, why, then it seems plain that till 'tis amended it is even in this Gentleman's Opinion, both a Snare to one, and a Prejudice to the other. If they can make it such a Bill as will not Destroy, but Preserve our Religion, Laws and Liberties, it should seem by Sir *Humphery's* own Words, that as yet 'tis a thing that will destroy them all. If the Commons by amending this Bill may bring it to be a means of Establishing Peace and Union among us, 'tis a Natural Inference to say, that without such Amendments it will not Establish Peace and Unity among us.



I will not pretend to dispute the Power of the House of Commons, to alter or amend any of their own Bills, 'tis without Question their Native Right; but whether they can so amend their Bill, as to bring it to be no Snare to the Church, no Prejudice to the Dissenters, a Preservation to our Religion, Laws and Liberties, and an Establishment of Peace and Union among us, I will not determine; but I am perswaded whenever 'tis so amended, as to be capable of all those good Ends, no Dissenter in the Nation will be unwilling it should pass; and till it is, no honest Man can wish it should.

### The CONCLUSION.

I Cannot dismiss this Discourse without putting my Author in Mind of the Infant State of the *English Church*, in the Days of *Henry the Eighth*, these were the Churches Days of suffering, which most People are willing to forget. *These Parsons forget that ever they were Clerks.* The History of the Reformation of *England* would put them in Mind, what Opposition they made to the six Articles, how they complain'd of the ill Usage of the Government, and how they themselves were than treated.

First, they tell us the King was impos'd upon, and abused by the Bishops, and other wicked Counsellors, to form the six Articles to destroy the growth of the Reformation, and it may be worth while to observe in what Terms they were represented to the King.

The Bishop of *Winchester* in particular, first took care to fill the King's Head with Fears of Civil Tumults and Commotions, a thing it seems the King was naturally very uneasy about, having, as he thought, made the People very much out of Temper by his dissolving the Religious Houses.

Popery was now the Establish'd National Church, but the Nation was full of Dissenters, *that is Protestants*; such as now are call'd of the Church of England, the Members of the Establish'd Church believing, or at least pretending that they were not safe, nor could not be secur'd, till more Laws were made for the Security of the Church, put the King upon these six Bloody Articles. The very Words which are Recorded of the Bishop of *Winchester* in this Case, are the very same made Use of by the present Gentleman against the Dissenters, *viz. He hasaught the King for his own Safe-guard, and the Safety, Quiet and Tranquility of the Kingdom, to be Careful Sharp and Severe against the Sectaries and Sacramentaries*, Acts a Mon. Vol. 2. Fol. 441. I would only desire this Gentleman to reflect a little, who these *Sectaries and Sacramentaries* were? Truly no-body, but your own dear Loyal Church, who are just Treating some People with the very same Terms, and Names of Distinction, which they in Contempt were treated with by their Enemies, the Papists. All the Use I shall make of it is to tell them it is a little Unkind; 'tis not according to the Golden Rule of *doing as they would be done by*. 'Tis not a very honourable way of Proceeding, to cry out of the hardship of that Usage when impos'd upon them, and make Apologies for the Moderation of it, when you want to impose it upon others.

When these six Articles were in Agitation in the House of Lords, Archbishop *Cramer* was the only Man, who had the Courage to withstand the Current of the Times, which he did with so much earnest Zeal, that the King commanded him to go out of the House, which yet he Modestly refused to do, pleading, tho' in a very humble manner his Privilege, and continued, tho' in vain to oppose it, and had certainly overthrown the Articles, says the Author aforesaid, *Nisi Pars Major Vicisset ut sepe solet Meliorem*, Fox. Act. Mon. Vol. 2. Fol. 243.

This was the proceeding against *Sectarian Schismatical Church of England*, Dissenters of those Days; I leave the Gentlemen of the Church to reflect a little, whether now they come to be the Establish'd National Church, they Treat the Dissenters under them, as they would be Treated; whether we have not the same Cause to think ourselves ill Treated, as they had in those Times; and whether indeed the Case is not harder with us, than it was with them, for that our Difference is about indifferent Things, theirs about Essential Catholick Points.

This Story serves not to reflect upon the Church, but to desire some Gentlemen of the Church to reflect a little upon themselves; how they were used, when they were counted the Schismatics and Sectaries; and how hard they thought themselves used, when Laws were made against them, on pretence of the Safety and Security of the National Church.